

REMARKS

Favorable and prompt allowance of the pending claims in the application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the Specification

The specification is amended to include the appropriate section headings and to remove reference to the pending claims. Entry of the amendment to the specification is respectfully requested in the next Office action.

2. In the Claims

Claim 1 is amended to more particularly recite the subject matter for which protection is sought. Amended claim 1 includes some of the subject matter of now cancelled claim 2. Amended claim 1 generally recites that the system requires that the same security feature is checked in different ways, namely the checking includes a check of a property of the security feature in areas of a lower security category, and only in areas with a higher security category the same property is checked with higher accuracy.

Support for the subject matter of claim 1 is found at least by way of paragraphs [0007] through [0015]. No new matter is considered to be introduced into the application by the amendment to claim 1.

Claim 2 is cancelled in view of the amendment to claim 1.

The remaining dependent claims are amended to start with "The," as particularly requested in the Office action. Claims 16 and 18 are amended in view of the suggestions in the action.

New claim 20 is submitted herewith which combines the subject matter of previously presented claim 1 and the allowable subject matter of claim 19. Allowance of this new claim is kindly requested in view of the prior allowability of the combination of this subject matter.

Entry and acknowledgment of the amendment to the claims is courteously asked for in the next Office communication.

3. Rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is merited in view of the amendment to claim 1 and the following remarks.

As now particularly described in amended claim 1, the system for checking security features of a document requires that the same security feature is checked in different ways, namely the checking includes a check of a property of the security feature in areas of a lower security category, and only in areas with a higher security category the same property is checked with higher accuracy.

Turning to *Bratchley*, contrary to the solution of the pending claims of checking the same security feature in different ways, *Bratchley* proposes checking two different security entities.

In accordance with *Bratchley*, a document of value has two security entities having different detectable characteristics: a high security entity and a low security entity (3:23-34). Indeed, *Bratchley* characterizes these security entities as being “clearly separate” which can be utilized in different situations depending upon the certainty of authentication (3:58-62).

For example, *Bratchley* states that the low security entity can be a single material, whereas the high security feature is a homogenous mixture of at least two components (4:1-12). As depicted in Fig. 1, *Bratchley* identifies the low security entity as being incorporated into a thread (22), and the high security entity is formed from a combination of two luminescent materials incorporated into the paper substrate (21) beneath the thread in a region (23) (11:41-46). It is readily apparent from these examples that indeed the low and high security entities of *Bratchley* are different from one another and therefore do not form the “same security feature” of the pending claims.

It will be pointed out that *Bratchley* discourages the use of a same security feature by indicating that security is limited and relatively easy for a counterfeiter to match the machine readable effect (2:42-52). Thus, the proposal by *Bratchley* of using two different security entities. Obviously from this passage, *Bratchley* does not

envision using a same security feature having lower and higher security features of the type in the pending claims.

In view of these observations on *Bratchley*, it is submitted that *Bratchley* does not disclose or suggest every feature required by the pending claims. Accordingly, the claims are not anticipated by *Bratchley*, and withdrawal of this rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

4. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: January 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205